



PATENT

I hereby certify that on the date specified below, this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date April 18, 2006 Jennifer Badley
Jennifer Badley

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Clarence T. Tegreene
Application No. : 10/813,967
Filed : March 31, 2004
Title : MOTE NETWORKS HAVING DIRECTIONAL ANTENNAS
Confirmation No. : 9160

Examiner : Andrew Wendell
Art Unit : 2643
Docket No. : 0104-003-006-000000
Customer No. : 44,765

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT AND INTERVIEW SUMMARY
IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents:

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated 28 December 2005. A request for a one month extension of time is enclosed. No further extension of time is believed necessary. However, in the event that a further extension of time is required, such extension of time is hereby requested. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees due to Deposit Account No. 502857.

Please amend the application as follows:

Amendments to the Specification are reflected in the listing which begins on page 3 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing which begins on page 5 of this paper.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On 11 April 2006, Examiner Wendell and his Supervisory Primary Examiner Duc Nguyen (such Examining Entity hereinafter collectively referred to as "Examiner") spoke with the undersigned (who was acting on behalf of the Applicant Entity and whom will hereinafter be referred to as "Applicant") by telephone regarding Examiners' Office Action of 28 December 2005. Applicant's recollection of the substance of that interview is set forth following.

During the course of the interview, Applicant explained to Examiner that Applicant had studied Examiner's Office Action, and the art of record specifically cited therein. Applicant discussed with Examiner the fact that the preamble of the unamended Independent Claim 1 recited "mote system" and that, accordingly, Applicant did not believe the primary reference (Acampora US Patent No. 5,697,066) cited by Examiner bore upon Applicant's Independent Claim 1.

Examiners responded that the word "mote" did not appear in the body of Claim 1, but instead only appeared in the preamble, and for that reason Examiner had ignored it during examination of Independent Claim 1. Applicant agreed to insert a mote recitation into the body of Independent Claim 1 so that Examiner could no longer ignore the word "mote."

Applicant also related to Examiner since Applicant's claims recite the word "mote," the Acampora reference does not bear upon such claims. Applicant agreed to demonstrate why the foregoing was true in the instant Amendment/Response.